

RARITAN PLAZA I 4TH FLOOR, RARITAN CENTER EDISON, NJ 08837-3616 908-417-5800 FAX: 908-417-5801

4 October 1993

Ms. Christina Purcell
Case Manager
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
and Energy
CN028
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0028

RE: Revised Feasibility Study; L.E. Carpenter Site, Wharton, NJ.

Dear Ms. Purcell,

On behalf of our client, L.E. Carpenter and Company, Roy F. Weston (WESTON), is pleased to submit the revised Final Feasibility Study for the L.E. Carpenter Site in Wharton, New Jersey. WESTON has made the revisions requested by NJDEPE and U.S. EPA since our last Feasibility Study submittal to you in November, 1992. Specifically, WESTON has included in this Final Feasibility Study the findings of the results of the slug tests performed in 1992, the well point investigation conducted in March of 1993, and the gamma logging effort also performed in March, 1993. In addition, WESTON has responded to and addressed comments made by NJDEPE and/or U.S. EPA in the following correspondence:

- o letter from NJDEPE dated 21 December 1992;
- o letter from NJDEPE dated 9 February 1993, with comments from U.S. EPA;
- o letter from NJDEPE dated 23 April 1993;
- o letter from NJDEPE dated 25 May 1993;
- o letter from NJDEPE dated 2 July 1993;
- o letter from NJDEPE dated 16 August 1993;
- o letter from NJDEPE dated 22 September 1993;

Consistent with our phone conversation on 30 September 1993, WESTON has included the discharge criteria provided by NJDEPE in your letters of 2 July (as amended by the 16 August and 22 September). Furthermore, as we discussed, those secondary contaminants with discharge criteria assigned will be included in the Record of Decision (ROD) as an appendix with a notation allowing elimination after 3 rounds of tests have proven that levels are below criteria levels. In addition, as we discussed, it is understood that provided that L.E. Carpenter is able to prove sufficient hydraulic capture, that no discharge criteria will be necessary for the reinfiltrated or recirculated water.

WESTON and L.E. Carpenter believe that Alternative 3 and 4 are the most viable and technologically feasible options. Both alternatives meet or exceed each of the non-cost evaluation criteria. All other alternatives considered were found not to meet or have major limitations with at least two of the non-cost evaluation criteria.



Please feel free to call me at (908) 225-3990 with any questions.

Very truly yours,

ROY F. WESTON, INC.

Martin J. O'Neill, C.I.H.

Project Director

C.Anderson cc R.Hahn